Market Research and Audience Development Project Open ITT
Clarification Questions and Responses

ADP Question Responses

1. The timeframe is tight to the point of possibly affecting the quality of work. Is there any wiggle room on timing or do you wish us to adapt methodologies to something that will fit the timescale rather than present what might be best for the project?

We are aware the timeframe is tight and therefore suppliers are invited to identify any constraints in delivery of the work and identify solutions through alternative methodologies and approaches to the project including the adjusting of timelines.

2. If appointed will we have access to current audience databases for analysis, but also with the intention of sending out surveys?

Yes we internal data sets will be made available to the appointed supplier including details on visitor buying behaviours and demographics where available via our CRM and Ticketing systems. It should be noted that there are some inconsistencies in data sets which would need to factored in by the supplier at analysis stage, these will be talked through in further detail upon appointment.

3. Please can we have the marketing plan for each site?

The approach to marketing post COVID has been inconsistent at each site, and structured around short-term campaign planning responding to market conditions, rather than overarching annual planning. The 2023-24 year will be the first year we shift back into an annual structure and proposition marketing plans are in development for sites now. A market analysis for sites for the 2022-23 year is available and attached in confidence.

4. Your strategy talks of innovative experiences but the research only looks to test ideas at Hartlepool. Is this correct or are you interested in testing new ways of engagement across the sites?

A capital development project is in motion for NMRNH which is why we are able to invest in testing new approaches to narrative, content and offer at that site. Currently the other sites do not have similar capital investment outlined for them, therefore the research should provide us with a jumping off point from which to develop new strategy for amending and improving offers which would then be subject to further testing. It is expected that through qualitive research methods we would better understand the barriers to entry for audiences and what might generate engagement, it is this information we would be able to develop ideas from.

5. Is there any research data available now?

We have a range of research data from previous segmentation to customer buying behavioural data. We have shared within the brief snapshots of some of that work and also include the last FY's Market Analysis. Fuller data will be shred with the appointed supplier.

6. Evaluation. Do you anticipate an evaluation process that is site perspective or will it be a centrally managed process? This affects methodology.

We have a small central Visitor Analysis and Evaluation team who will part of the core working group for this project and will implement ongoing evaluation strategy that falls from this piece of work. As each site is very different we feel it is important to monitor and evaluate on a granular level for each site but also to have a sense of the bigger picture of how that sits within the NMRN brand.

7. Hartlepool. Where are you in the capital project process. Can we have details please? Have you tested anything already?

We are still relatively early in the project. We have secured the land in which the new museum offer will sit and have appointed a project management team to delivery the activity. We have not yet tested anything in relation to the project.

8. Portsmouth Historic Dockyard. Please can we have the business plan to better understand the change in model

I am unable to share this at tender stage but further details will be made available to the appointed supplier. In summary:

- The dockyard has charitable trust who act as custodians of the historic estate on behalf of the Military Base. This is the Portsmouth Naval Base Property Trust (PNBPT). They also act as landlord to the attractions, shops and offices that sit on the site.
- Before COVID the was previously 'operated' by the NMRN. NMRN owned the IP for the PHD brand and manage destination marketing and visitor services for the site. But were a tenant of PNBPT. NMRN sold a series of tickets which provided access to HMS Warrior, HMS Victory, HMS M.33, Action Stations, The Royal Navy Submarine Museum (Gosport), Explosion Museum of Naval Ordnance (Gosport) and The Royal Naval Museum Galleries.
- Before COVID the Mary Rose Museum (also a tenant to the PNBPT) had a separate entrance to the site and sold a ticket to the Mary Rose Museum only.
- Therefore, a visitor needed to buy two tickets to visit all of the NMRN attractions and the Mary Rose Museum.
- In 2020 NMRN and Mary Rose Trust launched PHD Operations Ltd and took over joint operation of the site. This means that we now sell a joint ticket (at a value less than the cost of the two separate tickets), we jointly market the site, jointly own the IP for the brand and jointly manage visitor services. We do this through sharing resources and teams. We then each take a split of the income.
- The model also accounts for a change in ticketing strategy agreed by the partnership, moving from a volume driving strategy that depended on deep and wide spread discounting, to a yield based strategy designed to protect the value of the ticket, encourage direct booking and tactical discounting.

9. Please can you provide an indication of your budget for this research

Indicative budgets are shared within the listing on Contracts Finder. Evaluation criteria are also included within the brief which outlines the weighting attached to the price vs the quality.
https://www.contractsfinder.service.gov.uk/Notice/34fffe47-e86c-4d0d-9fb7-a7e88eddfe59

10. Can you confirm that you are looking for proposals to supply all packages mentioned in the brief? Or would you accept proposals for individual packages?

Ideally, we would like to work with a supplier who is able to offer responses to all packages of work. However, we have broken them in to separate packages to recognise the differing skill sets required to deliver each and are open to responses which include targeted packages or which align skills with other contractors or agencies.

11. What is the primary purpose for doing an Audience Segmentation? (e.g. is it to inform marketing / communications etc)

The purpose is to evolve and unifying organisational thinking and strategising of audiences. Historically NMRN has delivered different project across different sites which have undertaken targeted pieces of audience research. Consequently, we have no complete picture of our audiences and different teams and sites talk about them with different understandings. This is particularly challenging for those central teams such as programming, marketing and fundraising who then need to develop cross site or cross project activities. We would like an outcome of this project to be a unified sense of NMRN audiences which then goes on to inform things like marketing.

12. How are you defining your audience - do you see this as a segmentation of current visitors / engaged audience or a wider leisure audience?

Our current segmentation models use a mixture of existing and potential markets and identify how much we are accessing those markets and what the potential is for increasing impact and growing into them. We would expect a new segmentation model to offer similar opportunities.

13. It looks like you have multiple views of the market already (e.g. Audience Agency / Mosaic). These are both good from a tactical / targeting point of view so is the plan to keep running with these and for this research to add a further view of the market? Or are you looking to replace the existing view of the market with something new?

We are using these at the moment to fill gaps in our understanding. We would hope a new segmentation model would unify our understanding and inform our decision making. However, we recognise that other models such as mosaic have tactical benefits and therefor are open to the NMRN segmentation model sign posting to those established models where relevant.

14. Where does the current segmentation fall short / what gaps in insight are you missing from your current view of the market?

We are missing a few things:

- A unified view of NMRN. The models we have speaks to the specific of the sites and this is important and right at given points. But it doesn't enable us to report on or consider audiences as the 'NMRN' and that can be challenging when communicating with funders and key stakeholders.
- The lack of unity and cross over means we are also not able to understand where shared opportunities between sites/attractions/projects might be
- The lack of unity means that we are also talking at cross purposes within teams, so if programming and collections are speaking to one set of segmentation but marketing is speaking to another we may not be effectively delivering activities
- The current situation is particularly challenging to the central teams seeking to work across multiple sites and projects. Whilst FAAM having its own segmentation is fine for a team working exclusively on that site, it is difficult for a team who is asked to work one day on FAAM activity and the next of PHD. Whilst we accept that each site and project will have very different audiences we would like at least to understand those within the wider picture and develop mechanisms of common language, so even if the audience is difference are there characteristics which cross over or align?

15. In relation to package 6, are you looking for a complete and final Audience Development Strategy document or the insights / evidence for you (or another) to develop this document?

We hope that by stitching the packages of work together and their outcomes we would have an Audience Development Strategy by the end that identified existing audiences and potential, on a brand and site level, captures that into a cohesive segmentation and identifies where we see our priorities in terms of growth. This would be strategic however and we would not be expecting tactical recommendations for achieving that growth.

16. Please can you confirm if you have a current database of visitors / members that we can use as part of the research?

See answer to question 5.

17. Package 3 detailed requirements – can you provide further information about your expectations of a competitor analysis to understand the position of NMRN's individual propositions

We are looking for an overview of the significant competitors for the sites based on geographical, thematic or audience 'copy cat'. We aren't looking for detailed understanding of those competitors, but for the agency to recognise the nature and impact of the competitor and any competitive advantage held either way.

18. Package 4 detailed requirements – for the inventory of NMRN digital platforms, is this collating data from existing sources held by NMRN or is there a need for new research here

We would be able to provide access to our digital analytics platforms for current digital offer and to provide some historic data. We also have access to some research undertaken by our web development agencies and digital marketing agencies. Largely we would expect this to be a collation and rationalisation of data which provides an overview picture connected to the wider research and segmentation taking place in relation to the brand and offline offer. We may however have holes and gaps in the data which the appointed supplier may recommend some additional research is required to fill.

19. Could you provide some more information about the range and geographical spread of stakeholders that would need to be engaged in this process e.g. teams that would need to be involved

We will have a core central group of internal stakeholders who will be working on the delivery of the research work and will be the people who the appointed supplier will liaise with. This is made up of:

- Executive Director Operations
- Director of Marketing
- Head of Programming and Visitor Engagement
- Customer Relationship Management Lead
- Visitor Research and Evaluation Manager
- Major Trusts and Foundations Lead

This core team will liaise with colleagues across NMRN to loop them in to the project at various stages of delivery. When site specific activity is taking place we will leap programming, marketing, operational and collections colleagues at those sites. When digital activity is taking place, we will loop in the NMRN Digital Teams.

The appointed supplier would be expected to liaise with the stakeholders across our sites, but will be supported and facilitated by that central team.

Final Clarifications should be sent by 20th December 2022 at deadline of 1700 (5pm) to
tenders@nmrn.org,uk